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Abstract

Minutes for TG REVmc for Sept 28,

Next calls will be Oct 5, Oct 12, Oct 26, and Nov 2nd.

Action item list for Sept 28th:

1. ACTION ITEM: CID 301- Jon to talk to Donald Eastlake about his interest on this topic.

2. ACTION ITEM: CID 74- Jouni to look at creating a table in a submission.

3. ACTION ITEM: CID 213-Mark Rison assigned to research this issue further.

 Other Comments that are related: CID 263, 314, 324,

4. ACTION ITEM: CID 145-Mark RISON to submit a proposal

5. ACTION ITEM: Dorothy/Mark H. – To Send A list of about 8 comments that need the PHY group to review and provide input for resolutions.

1. Minutes for Sept 28th, 2012 teleconference:
	1. Called to order at 10:04 ET by Dorothy Stanley
		1. Reviewed Patent policy,
		2. Email was sent with the following list:
			1. Note that teleconferences are subject to IEEE policies and procedures, see:
			2. IEEE-SA PATENT POLICY
			3. IEEE CODE OF ETHICS
			4. IEEE-STANDARDS ASSOCIATION (IEEE-SA) AFFILATION FAQ
			5. IEEE-SA ANTITRUST AND COMPETITION POLICY
			6. IEEE-SA LETTER OF ASSURANCE (LOA) FORM
			7. IEEE-SA STANDARDS BOARD PATENT COMMITTEE (PATCOM) INFORMATION
			8. IEEE-SA PATENT FAQ
			9. IEEE 802 LAN/MAN STANDARDS COMMITTEE POLICIES & PROCEDURES
			10. IEEE 802.11 Working Group Policies and procedures
		3. No IP request or notification.
		4. Attendance:
			1. Dorothy Stephen, Adrian Stephens, Jounie Malinen, Mark Hamilton, Mark Rison, Peter Ecclesine, Jon Rosdahl
	2. Review Agenda
		1. Agenda:
2. Call to order, patent policy, WG policies and attendance
3. Comment resolution: Propose focusing on comments in clauses 1,3,4, and 10, plus any text resolutions from Indian Wells action items
4. Plan for next call(s) Oct 5, 12, 26, Nov 5
5. AOB
6. Adjourn

Reference: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-1082-02-0000-revmc-pre-ballot-comments.xls>

* 1. Comment Resolution:
		1. Adrian has an updated file for use to use 11-12/1082r3 as needed
			1. There is a new D0.4 that is on the server in the members area
			2. A new planning set of details available.
		2. Dorothy requested everyone to download the updated spreadsheet and noted that we should look at D0.4 and we will discuss it next week along with the timeline plan as well.
		3. Give presentation control to Mark H. and he brought up the MAC comment database for discussion:
		4. CID 39
			1. Review comment
			2. IEEE Style guideline shows only one page number on a page
			3. Editor to work to ensure that the page numbers are aligned
			4. Proposed resolution: Revisied – Editor is requested to ensure the pdf page numbers are aligned. – The IEEE Style guide prescribes only one page number per page.
		5. CID 341
			1. Review Comment -- IANA IKEv1 reference.
			2. Suggest that we decline this as our liason with IETF has added the missing info to the new RFC.
			3. Proposed Resolution: Reject: Rejected. Per liaison 11-12/0977r0, the additional parameters will be added to the IKE v1 registry. So the reference to RFC 2409 is still valid.
		6. CID 212
			1. Review comment: What is “MFP”
			2. Editorial comments should be handled initially by the Editor,
		7. CID 38
			1. Review comment:
			2. This has been there for a long time
			3. The term Area can be a general term, i.e. the area west of the Mississippi.
			4. Many examples of the use of “Area”.
			5. Regulators use “Area” - Range or Scope, not as a geometric term.
			6. Basic Service Area is defined by 802.11.
			7. Proposed Resolution: Reject: We call out networks as Local Area Networks or Metropolitan Area Networks. The dictionary says that the word “Area” can mean a range or scope. Regulators use Area, and not other terms for boundaries.
		8. CID 301
			1. Review Comment:
			2. There is only a small note on page 25, and in the SDL, but no other mention in the spec.
			3. No other objection.
			4. As an industry term, we do see it in use.
			5. There is a claim that a frame format for WDS is defined.
			6. The use of the 4-address format for WDS uses.
			7. Note that the new GLK group would have an opinion on this topic also.
			8. Straw Poll:
				1. Should we remove the term WDS?

Results: Yes – 3 No – 3 abstain - 1

* + - 1. There is only a definition of “Wireless Distribution” in one place in the spec.
			2. If we remove all the obsolete and the SDL, then it would go away anyway.
			3. We should leave the definition for now, and allow the new TGak to look into it.
			4. **ACTION ITEM**: CID 301- Jon to talk to Donald Eastlake about his interest on this topic.
			5. Look at page 122 – another Definition example of term defined but not used “Unreachable star”.
		1. CID 74
			1. Review comment.
			2. Do we agree in general to add a table somewhere?
				1. No objection
			3. **ACTION ITEM:** CID 74- Jouni to look at creating a table in a submission.
			4. Assign Comment to Jouni for submission.
		2. CID 323
			1. Review Comment
			2. Relates to CID 218
			3. The use of Sleep is in TDLS. – how STAs use AP to get info when asleep.
			4. The use of Sleeping may not be incorrect.
			5. We use doze and sleep with lots of ease.
			6. 10.2.1.18.1 – sleep is part of the WNM
			7. 4.3.13.1 lists the features that were added by WNM, and so it is here.
			8. What is being managed? Is the real questions.
			9. Many of the WMN management functions only manage point to point communication.
				1. They only manage STA to AP or some other Point to Point functionality
			10. The AP is managing and doing work for the STA which allows the STA to Sleep.
			11. The number of actual things that WNM-Sleep does is numerous, and so after we resolve some of those issues, then maybe a new name may be an outcome.
				1. Filtering, and buffering etc is still only point to point management.
			12. Radio Management implemented is required to get many of the WNM features.
			13. Changing the name was thought to loosing meaning.
			14. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. WNM-sleep mode is dependent on a device's support of the mandatory WNM features. And it enables a STA to sleep for extended periods of time, and this is clearly related to "sleep".
			15. There was an objection to the rejection.
			16. There are many features in the WNM-Sleep that don’t seem to address sleeping.
			17. Request for CID 96 to be included – no this will be part of the request to PHY panel of experts (open invitation to be sent to the reflector) to discuss before we discus it on a conference call.
		3. CID 213
			1. Review comment
			2. (see note from Mark Hamilton)
			3. Should we allow this.
			4. More time may be needed to look at this.
			5. How this is used in practice and in other definitions needs to be reviewed.
			6. **ACTION ITEM:** CID 213-Mark Rison assigned to research this issue further.
				1. Other Comments that are related: CID 263, 314, 324,
		4. CID 79
			1. Review Comment :
			2. There was an offline discussion that worked to improve the proposed resolution.
			3. Initial Proposed Resolution: Add a new paragraph after the third paragraph of 10.2.1.2:”An AP shall always assume a non-AP STA's Power Management mode is Active upon Association, or Reassociation from another AP, and the non-AP STA shall operate per the Active mode until it can inform the AP of a mode change. The STA's mode shall also be Active in relation to any AP with which it is not associated. Reassociation to the same AP shall not change the Power Management mode of the non-AP STA.”
			4. 10.2.1.1 – the change of the mode needs to be communicated.
			5. If the STA is not associated then it cannot use PS mode.
			6. A STA that has transmitted a management frame to an AP that it is not associated from which it expects a response shall remain in the Awake state until such a response is received, or until the procedure has timed out.
			7. All of the main frames being sent are part of a management frame exchange.
			8. The new Beacon variant and beam forming that are extended control frames.
			9. If we drop the “management” from the suggested sentence, then it would still be correct and may be clearer in the end.
			10. Trying to get rid of the word “Assume” should be done.
			11. Change where the SHALL is in the new paragraph.
			12. There is also a similar comment in CID 257.
			13. Reassociation to the same AP you do not want to have to go in and out of ACTIVE mode?
			14. Working on what the proper action took some time.
			15. Deleting the text about the Reassociation was thought to be the simplier definition.
			16. Can we add a note for the FP case?
				1. No consensus to add any note.
			17. Proposed Resolution: Add a two new paragraphs after the third paragraph of 10.2.1.2:”A non-AP STA shall be in Active mode upon Association, or Reassociation

A STA that has transmitted a frame to an AP with which it is not associated and from which it expects a response shall remain in the Awake state until such a response is received or until the procedure has timed out.”

* + - 1. Comment marked ready for motion.
		1. CID 145
			1. Review comment:
			2. **ACTION ITEM:** CID 145-Mark RISON to submit a proposal
		2. CID 49
			1. Review Comment:
			2. See CID 308
			3. We could also set DTIM Period to be reserved.
			4. The new sentence sets the DTIM Count field as reserved.
			5. We will allow other groups to test to ensure that we don’t have any issues.
			6. The DTIM Period value is still useful and we should keep it in there.
			7. A draft of the Proposal was started.
			8. Draft Proposed resolution: Revised: See CID 308. The DTIM Period value is still useful, and we can keep it here. Add a note that the DTIM Period is independent from any TIM Broadcast Interval(s).

Note – The DTIM Period carried in a TIM element in a TIM frame could be unrelated to any TIM Broadcast Intervals.

* 1. Proposal for next week:
		1. Look at the schedule
		2. For comments resolution, Mark and Jon are to solicit more input from others as possible.
		3. Note that Mark R. is changing affiliations, and may not be available on the call next week.
		4. Need to preannounce the comments that are targeted for the call identified a couple days ahead.
		5. Need to have people look at the PHY comments and a call to focus on that topic will be determined.
		6. **ACTION ITEM:** Dorothy/Mark H. – To Send A list of about 8 comments that need the PHY group to review and provide input for resolutions.
	2. Adjourned 12:00 ET.

**References:**

**Sept 28th:**

 Full Comment database file:

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-1082-02-0000-revmc-pre-ballot-comments.xls>

 Liaison Letter referencing IANA IKEv1 .

<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-0977-00-0000-liaison-to-ietf-group-repository.doc>